

The University of Southern Mississippi

The Aquila Digital Community

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Archive

4-6-2018

Faculty Senate Minutes - April 6, 2018

USM Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://aquila.usm.edu/faculty_senate_minutes

The University of Southern Mississippi
Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
Friday, April 6, 2018
Trent Lott Center 101/102; Hardy Hall 316 (IVN)

Present: Daniel Capper (Susan Mullican/Proxy), Jennifer Courts, Brian LaPierre, Cheryl Jenkins, Ann Marie Kinnell (Proxy), Bob Press (Proxy), Stacy Reischman-Fletcher, Amanda Schlegel, Amber Cole, Melinda McLelland (Proxy), Catharine Bomhold, Bradley Green, Anne Sylvest, Charkarra Anderson-Lewis, Cynthia Handley, Susan Hrostowski, Tim Rehner, Bonnie Harbaugh, Beth Tinnon, Mac Alford (Proxy), Joshua Hill, Susan Howell, Scott Milroy, Jeremy Scott, Eric Saillant, Donald Redalje, Adrienne McPhaul, Westley Follett, David Holt, Sharon Rouse (Proxy), Tom Rishel, Kenneth Zantow

Absent: Marcus Coleman, Kevin Greene, Nicolle Jordan, Will Johnson, Lilian Hill, David Lee, Deborah Booth, Sherry Herron, Charles McCormick, Heidi Lyn

1.0 Organizational Items

1.1 Call to Order **2:01**

1.2 Roll Call

1.3 Recognition of Quorum

1.4 Recognition of $\frac{2}{3}$ membership for voting on Bylaws and Resolutions

2.0 Adoption of Agenda - **moved Agenda item 10.0 (Unfinished Business) to follow item 3.0 (Program/Invited Guests)**

3.0 Program

3.1 Rodney Bennett, President (**comments following agenda items**)

3.2 Steven Moser, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (**comments following agenda items**)

3.3 Allyson Easterwood, Interim Vice President for Finance and Administration, with Lynn Smith, Director, Office of Fiscal Planning & Analysis (**comments following agenda items**)

3.4 Chad Driskell, Vice President for External Affairs (**comments following agenda items**)

3.5 Shannon Campbell, Director, Trent Lott National Center for Economic Development and Entrepreneurship, USM Heart Walk Fundraising Campaign –
Wanted to make sure that faculty has information about the Forrest/Lamar Heart Walk. Looking for an additional faculty member to be part of the planning committee. If there are also staff who would like to participate please inform Shannon. We raised a little over \$6,000 at USM this year. Traditionally, USM has been the single largest fundraising group in the Forrest/Lamar County area. Camp Shelby beat us this year, so we want to make sure we're on top again.

10.0 Unfinished Business

10.1 Academic Reorganization

10.1.1 Guests: Faculty Subcommittee on Advisory Bodies –

Stacy: Since Senate last met Mac and I met twice with the Faculty Governance and Representation Reorganization subcommittee that has been involved with aligning governing bodies with Vision 20/20. Discussion last time about our concerns were shared with the subcommittee via the memo that was drafted following our last meeting. In this body, most of our discussion was about size and representation and eligibility of Directors. The reason why we're revisiting this is because I feel like there was an unnecessary layer of interpretation where the authors or faculty colleagues who chose to dedicate their time and their research towards this component of the reorg, where all of a sudden they were hidden behind a document and there were no faces to it... their thought processes, their rationale, their research that led to that document and that led to their recommendations was not super clear. So they're here to present to us, faculty to faculty, to talk about where we are now (circulated revised, but not yet approved revision), and talk about how we can move forward. We had made a decision in our last meeting about procedural abeyance, but I think with more information we might want to reconsider that decision.

Sarah Morgan, Joyce Inman, Cindy Blackwell (Subcommittee Members)

Sarah: We want to talk about the aspirational goals that guided our recommendations and we would also like to take questions about the document that has been circulated. We feel all faculty want to spend our time with the two priorities of the university: academic excellence and scholarly productivity (creative activities, research publication/design). Those are the two priorities that are going to help elevate the stature of our university and hopefully help us with our top line, instead of just focusing on our bottom line. So, we suggested and recommended that governing bodies revisit the mission, the committees and the activities to more directly communicate how the activities of the governing bodies are related to those two primary priorities of the university and the faculty.

The second area that we set as an aspirational goal is having the governing bodies right sized. They need to be nimble and able to respond to change, and made up of people who are experienced enough and have enough knowledge and who want to serve on the committees and they also need to be representative of the faculty that will make up new structure. So we asked that the governing bodies consider right sizing and making sure that there is more adequate representation.

The third area is communication. The faculty as a whole need to understand what the governing bodies do and there needs to be clear lines of communication from the

faculty themselves and their elected representatives. Similarly, there needs to be communication between the governing bodies and the administration. We feel there needs to be trained faculty joining governing bodies and we'd like to see an all faculty convocation where the governing bodies can explain their purpose. And, we hope that will change the election process. We have tried to do this in an open and transparent way. We've taken feedback in written form from the chairs of the elected governing bodies and we're here now to take questions about the document that has been circulated.

Joyce: The document you received is our revised tentative draft and sections have been revised based on feedback from listening sessions from the different governing bodies. We took into account comments from those sessions and went back to our aim and goals that we used to guide this process and made revisions based on that. So all of those revisions to the original document that you saw back in the fall are highlighted throughout the document. You'll also see that there is a significantly revised timetable for what we would like to see happen. Initially we were asked to see if we could do elections this year and we talked to the governing bodies and the election heads and they said it could be done. We went back to the steering committee and said that it can be done. So, our first timeline that you saw in the fall indicated what that would look like if that played out. We then, after taking in all of the information from the different bodies, and listening with the bodies a couple times and listening to the election heads and meeting with IR, we said maybe doing elections this year isn't best for the overall cultural shift that we want to see. And if we want that cultural shift to take root and be positive and to be effective, then what we may need to do instead is align each body so that it fits the new organizational structure so that representation was actually being represented, have emergency elections for holes that we might have this year, and then move into our full elections next year when we have correct IR data (which we did not have this year even though we were told we would). There were a number of things where we said, we want to do this and we want to do it right so the revised timeline we feel best suggests that.

Sarah: The document has highlighted areas which address the changes that we made in response to comments from the governing bodies.

Comments/Questions:

Stacy: Where we left it is we basically said, we'll transition the leadership, but we voted that present Senators would remain Senators and that we would tackle this in the fall. It gets tricky because if we remain the Senate there's a significant percentage of representation from new schools that aren't included here (e.g., I did represent Arts & Letters and now I'll represent a new School). So if you look to where everyone is moving to, we in fact aren't a representative body and not in just a couple positions, but actually seven schools aren't represented. And if you flip our thinking and consider the faculty members who are in Schools that are not represented they don't have that

channel of communication and I just wonder about how tricky that is. Do we need to do full scale elections (we can't), but I think it would be in the best interest of the full faculty to figure out a way to close that gap and maybe do a one time only, suspending bylaws or extending how we're conceptualizing procedural abeyance? In order to populate ourselves next year to make sure we're fully representative.

Tim Rehner: We already have the practice in the Senate for not closing the last faculty meeting and extending it over. We would do it in two parts. When they do that second part (in June) in what is the new academic year, because that is when we would really install the people. So then it would be just an extension. It's just a suggestion. There are probably a lot of limitations to that suggestion.

Elizabeth Tinnon: I haven't met the people who are in my new College (School), so I think it would be difficult to find a representative in the new structure at this point. I do hear what you're saying about the seven (unrepresented Schools). Is there not a way that maybe we have a representative for them in this first transitional year and then after that it moves into the Colleges so that they are represented? It can't hurt in the Senate to have more people involved in that, but just for a year because it's going to take time to transition and people to get to know each other as we become different entities.

Sarah: I believe that Academic Council has agreed to take a look at what their structure looks like, where the gaps are and do an emergency election to fill in those gaps. So you may want to talk to them.

Stacy: And what they call an "emergency election," I don't know what they mean by that.

David Holt: As I read current Senate bylaws, it basically says that if there is a change in Colleges, etc. we roll members off as their terms expire and then we replace them with (someone from) the affected unit or adjust as necessary. So the Faculty Senate bylaws actually do have it written in that we can transition. So as we have members that are currently not continuing on this year, I recommend we make sure that that new Schools are represented and we can go out and get the new representatives, which would mean an election by that new body (the affected unit) and they would figure who they want to be seated. And, if for some reason not all seven are covered by the end of the summer, then I would recommend the Senate revisit this and perhaps suspend the number of Senators in our body, extend it to cover whatever's left over. I suspect it's going to be just another three or four. We may be able to stay within the current bylaws of 45.

Stacy: So, what I worked out, I didn't account for Senators who would have been rotating off at the end of this year, but just for known resignations...

Tom Rishel: We decided we were going to extend those terms, so that they will in fact, not roll off. (Stacy: Correct).

Joyce: Academic Council is doing the same thing.

Stacy: So they're keeping their existing body and augmenting it?

Joyce: They're asking people who are rolling off to consider serving another year.

David: We can make that adjustment without a lot of problems and be able to handle this transition.

Stacy: Dr. Rehner mentioned appointment? We've heard "election" and "appointment."

Tim: In the past, when people have vacated positions during a current year, you could appoint someone from that respective College to keep the balances of representations as they were to finish that person's term, until the next election (with input from that department).

David: The affected unit has to be notified and has to be upon approval of the Senate. It's just a matter of getting someone who that unit agrees will represent them. I think it's an easy fix.

Tom: I agree that what we do is what would effectively be an appointment for one year (or until the time of the next election); that person can choose to be a candidate or not when the next election comes around. That does provide us with representation through the transition and I don't think that's a difficult process, primarily guided by the affected unit and then formally appointed by the president of the Senate.

Don Redalje: I have a comment on the proposed membership of the Senate according to the document. On page 4 it says, "note that the School of Ocean Science and Engineering is located on the Gulf Park campus..." when in fact it is not. It is distributed with 15 or 16 faculty at Stennis, 15 or 16 faculty in Ocean Springs, and 2 at Gulf Park. And there will be another location in Gulfport. It's distributed across 60 miles of Coast. We are budgeted through Hattiesburg.

Sarah: We will make that correction.

Brian LaPierre: Question about membership. If you look at the way that the representation is apportioned to each College, I guess it's one representative per College or School? I just wonder if that was the most equitable formula for determining representation because that would seem to under represent very large Schools/Colleges and then over represent the smaller Schools and Colleges. If you look on page 4, where you have the Undergraduate Council membership, it seems that you tried to use a formula there to peg representation to size. For example, if you use the FTEs there, for instance, and plug that into the proposed membership of the future Senate you get these big discrepancies between large Colleges and small ones. I wonder if pegging Senate numbers to one per School is the most equitable way to do it.

Joyce: It wasn't about Schools/Colleges based on size, but based on the role of each body. So, the Faculty Senate, part of our concept was, it doesn't matter how large a stake you have, you have Senators. One of our primary goals was to have smaller, stronger bodies. Let's face it, we don't have more faculty, we have fewer faculty to serve. Twenty percent of the faculty is doing the work, as everyone in this room knows. So our idea was how do we help spread that work out and make sure that it is good work and make sure that people aren't elected to that spot and they forgot to opt out and therefore don't want to do the work. So, if we have smaller bodies with people who

want to serve then they will communicate more. Our thought was we could improve communications and improve the ability of bodies to do the work that they want to do.

Stacy: Mac pointed out that correlating Senators to Schools creates a built in mechanism for communication, which right now is inconsistent.

Sarah: And formalizing those channels of communication I think would help also, so that everyone knows this is my Senator and this is who I should talk to

Stacy: Also, right now we have 10 standing sub committees (not ad hoc) and that is a variable when we talk about Senate size. So that is something we need to look carefully at next year when we fill in the gaps. Right now we have two at-larges, Hattiesburg and the Coast, and we'll need to make sure the at-large number is the right number so that we're not all on three or four standing committees.

David: I agree with what Stacy is talking about having tried to put people on committees, but I categorically disagree that a smaller Senate is stronger. It really comes down to representing the faculty. The way the Senate is designed right now is not to try and represent every department. It's really about representing a certain number of faculty and depending on the size of the College we tried to make sure that not so many people came from one department. Are we accidentally forcing people into service, which in my opinion makes a weaker Senate?

Tom: It's my understanding that the proposal that we received is not binding (Sarah: these are recommendations for consideration). It is the privilege of the Senate to determine its own composition and structure as part of the bylaws (obviously under revision). So part of the whole idea of extending terms and waiting on elections is to give us an opportunity to see how the new administrative structures play out and how all of that is put into place. Once we get a clear vision as to what that looks like, then we as a Senate can then take these proposals under consideration and determine for ourselves how we want to structure the Senate.

Stacy: We do that when we reconvene next year no matter what.

Alan Thompson: I think that conversation should include the entire faculty body. This proposal reduces the size of the Faculty Senate and I believe that there are people on campus who may have problems with that. I'm curious if there is any interest in engaging in that conversation today?

Tom: Not sure of the mechanism to make that happen, but we should send some communication out to the entire faculty about the restructuring of Senate subsequent to the reorganization and ask for input.

Sarah: We asked that the governing bodies consider our recommendations as well as committee structures and bylaws and everything that has to be done as part of the reorganization. I would also ask that you correspond with other governing bodies across campus.

Stacy: If I were to summarize, I think this means we make our big decisions that involve a lot of people and a lot of thought and all of these suggestions. We dig into that meaty

content in the fall and we identify which Schools are missing from our membership for next year and include them.

Tim: I do think conversations with those units that are missing representation need to be initiated sooner, rather than later.

Alan: When would the Senate engage the larger faculty in the discussion? In the fall?

Stacy: Yes. So that we know what all of that is, so that we can engineer our election.

David Holt: I suggest we do a listening session before May if we've gotten approved documents, or people will think we've run away with the whole project. When the document we have today gets approved, I'm hoping we can get this to our faculty this semester, before the summer rolls through.

Stacy: Before we adjourn for the summer, we can tell them what we know. Let them know where we are and how we got there.

Tim: This proposal is a recommendation for next year. Going into next year we're going to be the same size Senate, or larger with those who are going to come in and represent the other Schools. I don't think there is an imperative that we have to do anything this semester, because we are still going to be the size that we are now in the fall. We can make a decision about how to pull in the overall faculty once we have a decision from this body. Otherwise it's just a wide-open conversation.

Stacy: It's going to a while for the seven Schools that aren't represented to come up with these processes to fill the gaps. The Schools that will not be represented in the reorg, when we all change to our new Schools are School of Construction and Design, School of Child and Family Studies, School of Kinesiology and Nutrition, School of Speech and Hearing Sciences, School of Management (because of a resignation), potentially a library position, so that's six that I know of. That's if we just all change our hat to the new School affiliation.

Alan: We need to make sure we go out and sell the value of service. And we should also reaffirm that if the Senate or faculty at large decides that folks with less than three years experience are eligible to serve on Senate, that's the faculty's prerogative and not the prerogative of the subcommittee. (Stacy: No one is arguing that point).

Stacy: I move that we move forward from here, we will fill in the gaps, tackle the big items when we have full representation from all of the Schools and we know that all of those issues include size, membership and everything that we've discussed.

David Holt: I don't think we need a motion at all because we're just doing what we're doing right now. Let's just move on until next time.

Tom: Do we need some kind of procedure in order to recruit and appoint faculty to represent Schools that are not currently represented during these future conversations?

David: **I move that we replace the current Senators with the Schools that do not have representation and give those Schools an opportunity to recommend someone to hold appointment for the next year (Motion removed from the floor).**

Alan: I believe we would have to vote to come out of procedural abeyance first before we would do something of that nature.

David: We moved to procedural abeyance on replacing senators and elections. This is not an election and it actually includes replacing Senators. That was part of our procedural abeyance.

Tom: We do need to perhaps replace folks who are not willing to have their terms extended or are resigning, but we're also talking about bringing in additional Senators to represent those Schools that would otherwise not have representation for one year while we're having these conversations about restructuring the Senate.

David: I remove my motion from the floor (above). I recommend that we go to procedural abeyance about the number of Senators that we're allowed to have per the bylaws. If we do that, then we can just appoint the new people that are impacted.

Motion: I move that we extend our procedural abeyance of the bylaws to include the cap of Senators beyond 45 (Stacy: We may or may not need to do that, but can if we need to). **(Passed, one opposing vote)**

Discussion:

Bonnie: I think one of the things that the committee presented about the lack of service and service being valuable is important to note. I also think her (Dr. Morgan) term of us as a Senate and taking that word literally, we don't have a House of Representatives on this campus, we serve as both (Senate and House of Representatives) and shouldn't be held to this 1 or 2 Senator per state concept. If anything, I think the reorganization has done a great thing in trying to keep us alive, but it's also diluted faculty voice through administrators because of the dilution of the ratios of administration to faculty. And this is a place where you can capture issues and bring them up. I'm for every School having a Senator and to not do that wouldn't be making us better; it would be keeping us where we have been where some schools are not represented well. I'm for us expanding the numbers, at least temporarily, until we can figure out more of what we think we want once we see how this new structure is going to work.

Jeremy Scott: I think this is a little premature since there are some Schools that are not even formed yet. Maybe it's better to wait until these Schools form, so that they know who they are and approach each other then and decide who they want to represent them.

Comment: The motion allows us the latitude to make the change when it becomes appropriate. (Senate voted on Motion above)

David: **Motion: I now move that we attempt to fill in and represent all Schools in the new Vision 20/20 structure with terms starting in August. (Passed)**

Discussion:

Tom: How long will those terms be?

David: We're in procedural abeyance for how long terms last, so it doesn't matter.

Tim: Until the next election

(Senate voted on Motion above)

4.0 Approval of Minutes

4.1 March 2018 - **Approved**

5.0 Officer Reports

5.1 President-Elect – Stacy Reischman-Fletcher:

Reorganization and representation: *background for when the FGR subcommittee point of the agenda comes up.*

Since we met last Mac and I have met twice with the Faculty Governance and Representation subcommittee charged with aligning faculty governance bodies in the reorganization. At our last senate meeting we discussed the senate and the reorganization, specifically in relation to the recommendations of the FGR subcommittee. Most of our discussion was about size and representation and the eligibility of directors to serve. After our last senate meeting, we crafted a memo describing our intentions to remain in procedural abeyance, to keep the current senate seated, and to hold elections in 18-19 for 19-20.

In our two meetings since, Mac and I have met with our faculty colleagues on the FGR subcommittee and we shared our memo with them. They shared with us a revised, and not-yet-approved version of that committee's initiative. (It was included in the email you received from Mac yesterday.) Just this week, we met again to talk about how we can work together to have a senate next year that is *representative of the reorganization*.

We have invited our faculty colleagues who took the lead in visioning how to align governance bodies with the reorganization to be here today to share some of the thought processes that led to their recommendations. I hope this assists us in coming to a mutual understanding of what might be needed to move forward. I want to reiterate: these are our faculty colleagues. They offered their time and effort for the reorganization. Substantial research and thought led to their recommendations.

- We should consider how representative we are (or are not) of the faculty as a whole in the new school/college organization. I have prepared a document showing representation based on the new school structure.
- How can we work with the timeline recommended?
- Can we populate senate in 18-19 in a way that reflects the reorg?
- Options:
 - Can we extend our ideas of procedural abeyance to include a one-time fix to appoint/elect additional, replacement senators from non-represented schools?
 - Emergency elections?
 - Leave as-is and have almost 25% of schools not represented.
- We should consider that the Provost has the ultimate say (approval) in this.

March 6, 2018 FS Executive with the President: (Mac was also at this meeting)

1. We asked about a line-item in the budget for **salary equity**. Allyson Easterwood (VP for Finance and Administration) said there is a line item, but that no dollars are attached. (We have heard in previous meetings that this would require further developing income sources.) We are moving towards addressing salary equity through the reviewing and revising present “classifications” for staff. Reviewing faculty classifications will follow. VPAA says we are also addressing this through reviewing CIP codes. The starting point is knowing the *size* of the problem. A solution will take several years. This goal this year is getting good data. The President plans to provide an update at the August Executive Retreat.
2. We discussed the **Evaluations of Administrators**. We explained that they are administered through Senate, but that they are not historically a project originating with the senate, but with SACSCoC. We discussed anonymity and the inventory of questions. The President mentioned he is interested in “meaningful” review of his job performance. He said the premise should be making the place better. I’ve since followed up with Associate Provost Doug Masterson about the process and instrument we use. We are in the middle of discussions.
3. **Intercession counted as load?** Provost Moser responded that workload guidelines will help. *In a later meeting, the provost mentioned that intercessions start before contract dates, so faculty couldn’t be “required” to teach in them against their wishes.* We explained in subsequent meeting that the senate is working on a recommendation about intercession & load.
4. The President spoke of our new relationship with the City Council, Parks & Recreation, and Reed Green Coliseum. The President sees these partnerships as ways to leverage support from the community to maintain our infrastructure (and build upon the city’s infrastructure) that will draw people to Hattiesburg, which will be good for the university and the city.

March 9, 2018 meeting with FGR subcommittee about aligning governing bodies with reorganization. (Our first one) *Some of this may be redundant after the FGR subcomm presents at the senate meeting on April 6.*

1. We are in a consultative phase where the reorg committee is seeking input from stakeholders.
2. The hope is that initiatives can be adjusted and that changes can be agreed upon.
3. Next, revised initiatives go back to the Provost.
4. We discussed the size of the Senate. The subcommittee envisions governing bodies that are “smaller and stronger” and populated with people who *want* to serve. Mac and I shared that senators saw a smaller senate as having a smaller voice.
5. We discussed specific changes to the initiative (that are reflected in the April 4th version). They include:

- a. Non tenure-track faculty can serve. A minimum of three years at USM is required.
 - b. The ratio of tenure track to teaching track member “should attempt to be maintained.”
 - c. Senate membership increased by 2 at-large (one coast, one HB) and one from libraries.
6. We shared the Senate memo that addressed our concerns about rushing elections, the size of senate, if directors can serve as well as our solution to carry on next year with the current senate and to work on bylaws and elections in 18-19. It did not seem like our memo (response, solution) was accepted well. Our intentions might have been misunderstood.

March 28, 2018

Mac and I met to discuss:

1. Practices for fulfilling resigned positions this late in the year while we are in procedural abeyance.
2. Increasing the size of the bylaws committee in order to address the significant, upcoming work of that committee.
3. The spreadsheet to be presented by Allyson Easterwood.
4. The OLSC recommendation coming from the Academics committee.

April 3, 2018 Senate Executive with President (President was absent): *Not typical to have 2 such meetings between senate meetings*

1. We shared that they will be getting a recommendation about the OLSC. They offered suggestions for colleagues who might be valuable in our full senate discussions.
2. More discussion about intercession counting in load (and that a recommendation was coming).
3. Discussion about the position elimination spreadsheet that will be shared at our April 6th meeting. Allyson Easterwood is prepared to address it and to field questions. She prefers to receive questions in advance. Lynn Smith will also be at Senate.
4. Chad Driskell will address legislature issues at senate, as well as share with senators his roles and responsibilities at USM.
5. We discussed that senate is working on a statement about shared governance.

Questions/Comments:

Beckett: What is wrong with our shared governance statement?

Stacy: Based on the other one we had it seemed shorter? The Governance Committee may be working on that today?

Beckett: There is a shared governance statement in the Faculty Handbook and I was on the committee that worked on that and I think it's a pretty good one. So, I was just

wondering why we're wondering off to look at Jackson State's. At least for me, I worked on it, I'd like to what's wrong with the USM one?

Don: It is in the report that will be presented later

April 4, 2018 meeting with FGR subcommittee about aligning governing bodies with reorganization.

We met for a second time to determine how the senate can collaborate with the FGR subcommittee. Marek Steedman, reorg liaison, summed up the meeting this way:

1. The initiative team will be on the agenda of the next Faculty Senate meeting (this Friday), and will present the initiative in its current form and solicit feedback from Senators.
2. The Faculty Senate will look at how its current representation lines up with the reorganized structure of the University, and develop a plan to align their membership with that structure for next year. FS doesn't anticipate needing any special elections this Spring. The hope expressed by the initiative team is that Faculty Senate can formally adopt the timeline that Graduate and Undergraduate council will be using, but that would require full Faculty Senate consideration.
3. The Faculty Senate has concerns about the status of Directors on the FS going forward, and about the ultimate size (number of members) of a future Faculty Senate, but there was agreement to engage in conversation to see if some common ground can be reached on those issues.

We left the meeting with a plan to add this to Old Business at the April 6 senate meeting. Since this meeting, I worked out a spreadsheet showing representation based on new school affiliation. This will likely be addressed in this meeting, with particular attention to how it involves us adopting one-time-only measures for soliciting membership that do not correlate to our current bylaws.

5.2 Secretary – No report

5.3 Secretary-Elect – No Report

6.0 Decision / Action Items

6.1 None

7.0 Standing Committee Reports

7.1 Academics

Stacy: We have two recommendations that were sent out yesterday.

Westley Follett: Before I read, I will preface with this. The first of these concern the OLSC and the recommendation is the product of consultation with various people. It's been an ongoing organic thing and took into account discussions held here in Faculty Senate over previous months. It came out of committee, so it reflects input from members of the

committee. I don't think any of us would pretend that we are full experts on workings of the OLSC and all matters concerning online learning, so certainly the points here are wide open to discussion and comment.

7.1.1 Recommendation 1: Online Learning (Guest: Tom Hutchinson) – (Full recommendation read during meeting and e-mailed to Senate April 5)

FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDATION #3, 2017–2018

Authored and Submitted by the Academics Committee

A FACULTY SENATE recommendation to dissolve the Online Learning Steering Committee (OLSC) and reform it with a new structure, new membership, and a new charge.

WHEREAS, in its current configuration the membership of the OLSC includes faculty representatives from each of the academic colleges of the University, and

WHEREAS, the University's Plan for Academic Reorganization will render the current collegiate representation of the OLSC redundant, and,

WHEREAS, the large size of the OLSC, with twelve faculty members, three staff members, and seven ex-officio members, has made it difficult for the OLSC to convene monthly as stipulated by its own by-laws, and

WHEREAS, the work of the OLSC has primarily concerned technological and pedagogical issues relevant to online learning, and

WHEREAS, it is the opinion of the Faculty Senate that the growth of online learning at the University ought to be directed by policies arising from a strategic vision of the role of online learning in the furtherance of the University's mission;

THEREFORE WE RECOMMEND that the Office of the Provost dissolve the OLSC and reform it with a smaller number of members, primarily faculty who are representative of the new organizational structure of the University, and fewer staff and ex-officio members, and

WE FURTHER RECOMMEND that the charge delivered to the new committee include the formulation of policy recommendations concerning: the strategic, purposeful growth of online learning at the University; the evaluation of online courses to ensure the delivery of authentic course content and the occurrence of regular and substantive instructor/student interaction that utilizes best pedagogical practices for online learning; the differentiation of treatment between fully online students and partially online students in matters such as enrollment windows and caps; and the impact of online teaching responsibilities upon faculty welfare.

THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RECOMMENDED that copies of this recommendation shall be sent to the Online Learning Steering Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Gulf Coast Faculty Council, the Provost, and the President.

Comments/Questions:

Westley: Much of the thinking here was to provide direction and recommendations. It wasn't to tie the hand of future committee or the Office of the Provost.

Bonnie: When this committee was put together initially there were a lot of unknowns. I see iTech (online learning) taking over some aspects and this would give an opportunity for more pedagogical inclusion. We need to separate some of the functions and this will give us the opportunity to do that. More is known now about what we're doing and we're in a different place, so I support this recommendation.

David Holt: **I recommend we approve the recommendation (passed, with one abstention)**

7.1.2 Recommendation 2: Intersession Load – **(Full recommendation read during meeting and e-mailed to Senate April 5)**

FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDATION #4, 2017–2018

Authored and Submitted by Westley Follett

A FACULTY SENATE recommendation to give faculty the option of counting courses taught during intersessions in partial fulfillment of their contractually obligated teaching load assignments.

WHEREAS, the addition to the Academic Calendar of the August, December, and May intersessions increases the opportunity for faculty to teach outside the Fall and Spring semesters, and

WHEREAS, the option to teach intersession courses in partial fulfillment of a contractually obligated teaching load assignment would allow faculty to reduce their teaching load in a regular semester of that same academic year, thereby potentially freeing time for the pursuit of research or other scholarly or creative activity, and

WHEREAS, some faculty may wish to teach intersession courses that will *not* count in fulfillment of their contractually obligated teaching load assignments, thus teaching intersession courses in addition to their normal teaching load in the Fall and Spring semesters and thereby increasing their annual earnings in the same manner as teaching courses in the summer term;

THEREFORE WE RECOMMEND that faculty who teach intersession courses retain at their sole discretion the option of counting those intersession courses in partial fulfillment of their contractually obligated teaching load assignments;

THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RECOMMENDED that copies of this recommendation shall be sent to the Faculty Senate, the Gulf Coast Faculty Council, the Provost, and the President.

Discussion/Comments/Questions:

David: I think there might be hold up on the “sole discretion” line because it may not always be academically feasible to allow people to do that. There may be some departments that may be forced to make an intercession be an overload because they deem that teaching service in the regular load. So, it should be an option that’s available, but making it the faculty’s decision alone I think is going to be a sticking point. I recommend that we weaken that language a bit and just say, faculty can say they want that to count. Remove the word “sole.” (**Friendly Amendment**)

Tim: I wonder if it’s premature to even move this forward because, I think, there is still considerable negotiation that has to happen about how that’s actually going to work. We might want to do that resolution or that recommendation once we know some details. I don’t know what they’re going to do about awarding credit and load based on when contracts start and when intercessions are going to be. I think at some level that’s still an administrative question that they need to answer. We may want to have this recommendation once we know what they want to do.

Stacy: It can go back to committee.

Westley: The Faculty Senate was asked to provide an opinion on this in October of last year and it’s taken us this long to get it together.

Tim: I withdraw my observation then.

Josh: We (reorganization committee) are trying to put together a workload policy. There was one in the original proposals that was not well received by the Provost’s Office and we had been asked to retool that and that is in process. That policy may also have impact on the intercession recommendation because workload policy will be part of that, so I would say that it might be premature to move forward now. I would move to table it. The recommendation that we (reorg committee) are presenting to the Provost’s Office should be done before the Senate’s next meeting, but I don’t know if that will at all be reflective of what the Provost decides to do.

Tim: It could be that what the Senate does is request that your group share that iteration with the Senate in order to react to it, so it can accompany what goes forward procedurally.

Tom: It sounds like the request for the Senate to provide input was done for the consideration of the group that is drafting that recommendation (workload policy). I think we should move this forward and submit it to the appropriate bodies.

Stacy: I think this is an opportunity for us to comment upon a decision before it's being made. **Vote to approve recommendation (with Friendly Amendment striking the word "sole") and send to the listed bodies (Passed, with 2 opposed)**

7.2 Administrative Evaluations – **Committee Chair:** Melinda McLelland

Committee Members: Amber Cole, Anne Sylvest

1. The results for deans and upper administrative have been completed and distributed as requested by Dr. Moser.
2. The results for department chairs/directors will be analyzed and distributed by the end of April or early May.

Resolutions or Recommendations: None at the moment

7.3 Awards – (Sharon Rouse, Committee Chair)

The Awards Committee reviewed and selected from qualified applicants a recipient for the Faculty Memorial Scholarship Endowment.

The Faculty and Staff Awards Day Ceremony is Friday, May 4, 2018, at 1 p.m. in the Trent Lott Center on the Hattiesburg Campus. Please share this information and invite the university community through Listservs, mail lists, and by announcing it in meetings. Also, faculty who completed service-learning class projects through the Center for Civic and Community Engagement will display their posters in the atrium of the Center.

7.4 Bylaws – Has one person on it now. We will need to populate the subcommittee.

7.4.1 Volunteers needed for upcoming year – Let Stacy know now or later if you're interested

7.5 Elections – (Tom Rishel, Committee Chair)

At the March 2018 Faculty Senate meeting the following motion was approved:

Motion that we (the Senate) remain in procedural abeyance with current Senate members' terms extended for a period of one year, with the agreement of those serving in those positions (passed).

Following up on that motion, Senate leadership drafted a memo to the Reorganization Sub-Committee to make them aware of the discussion of the Senate and the motion to postpone elections. The memo is available elsewhere in the Senate documents. [Faculty Senate re reorg 030818]

In response to the memo the Reorganization Sub-Committee requested to attend the April Senate meeting to present their recommendations. Those recommendations are available elsewhere in the Senate documents [Initiative Implementation Plan 4.2.18.docx]

The Senate received the recommendations with questions and discussion including concern expressed by multiple members regarding size of the Senate and faculty representation. Motion was passed to extend procedural abeyance to allow the Senate to recruit and appoint members from schools without representation for one-year terms to participate in the process of re-organization of the Senate in response to the re-organization of the University.

7.6 Finance – **No Report.** We need to repopulate committee.

7.6.1 Volunteers needed for upcoming year

7.7 Governance – (Don Redalje)

The Governance Committee met via conference call on April 4, 2018. Some of the committee members were unable to participate and submitted input in e-mail or by phone earlier than the conference call.

The committee considered 2 questions:

- 1) Do the Faculty need to develop a new and different statement on shared governance?
- 2) Do the Faculty feel that we need a stronger statement that more clearly defines a more appropriate role in the selection of those administrators to whom they will report? This is primarily directed to choices for new Program Coordinators/Chairs and school Directors, but is not necessarily limited to these positions.

In regard to question 1, the committee reviewed the current statement on shared governance in the Faculty Handbook (section 2.12), a newly approved statement on shared governance approved at Jackson State University, and a resolution on Academic Freedom and Shared Governance passed by the Senate in 2007. There was general consensus that we should look at the current Faculty Handbook to determine what is there on shared governance. Section 2.12 is nearly identical to the resolution passed by the Senate in 2007. The committee liked much of what is in the policy from Jackson State University, but agreed that there were parts of that policy that were more specific to Jackson State and the situation there. We may want to consider the points in that document that are consistent with our views of shared governance. The committee is still considering the statement in section 2.12 of the Faculty Handbook to determine if this statement is clear and strong enough as is or if we would like to make a stronger case for shared governance in the form of a proposed resolution that would be submitted to the Senate for consideration.

The issues in question 2 are of equal importance to the Faculty. We looked at Proposal 6 that was submitted to the Office of the Provost as part of the university reorganization process. That proposal included two parts – one that proposed the development of a Leadership Enhancement Series Institute to help new and current administrators become better leaders and administrators, and another part that stressed the importance for greater Faculty inclusion in the decision process for appointing new administrators that will supervise the Faculty. The committee agreed that the establishment of a Leadership Enhancement Institute would be a very good thing for the

university to do. We then asked the question of what is in the current Faculty Handbook about Faculty involvement in both the appointment of new administrators and in the review of their subsequent performance. There does not appear to be any statement in the Faculty Handbook about the role of Faculty in the hiring or appointment of Chairs and Directors. The usual process involves the formation of a search committee that is appointed by the next higher administrator, generally the college Dean. Faculty then review applicants and provide a list of the top candidates for on campus interviews. After these interviews, the committee provides the Dean with a list of candidates that were viewed as acceptable for the position. The Dean then makes the choice on whom to recommend to the Provost for the position. Some of the committee members feel that the Faculty need to have a much stronger involvement in this process. We are still considering ideas of what form this stronger involvement might take.

During our discussions we did review section 8.4.7 of the Faculty Handbook. This section describes the process for “Chairs/Directors Periodic Review” and the role that Faculty play in this review process. Section 8.4.7 states that new Chairs or Directors will be reviewed during the Spring semester of the third year in the position. The Dean will review the performance and the Faculty will review the performance. The Dean will consult with the Faculty about their review and a decision for the reappointment of the Chair or Director will then be made. For continuing Chairs and Directors, that review will take place in the Fall semester of the fifth year and will include both review by the Dean and review by the Faculty followed by consultation and then a decision on reappointment. Point 3 in this section states that if the Faculty do not recommend reappointment and the Dean concurs, the Chair or Director will be informed and they will continue in their position until the end of their current term. If the Dean does not concur, then he/she must inform the Faculty as to why they did not concur and a justification of the reappointment decision.

The committee will continue to review these issues with the goal of preparing a proposed resolution should one be viewed as needed that will be submitted to the Senate at the May meeting for the Senate as a whole to consider and discuss.

7.8 Gulf Coast – No Report

7.9 Handbook – (David Holt)

David: No official report, but I would like to amend to that I’m in possession of a Progressive Discipline Policy that the subcommittee has been working on. It has been reviewed and approved by council at this time and is now moving to the Handbook Committee to review. We will make you aware of it and get it to the list serve as soon as it gets past the Faculty Handbook Committee, which means we will be calling a meeting this coming month. I will announce the day and time. We will be able to move forward by May, at least through Senate, with a Progressive Discipline Policy.

Questions/ Comments

Beckett: What about the rest of the Handbook? What is happening with that?

David: Same answer as before. It's still our Faculty Handbook; it's still sitting there and waiting for them to give us how they're going to want it rearranged and the Faculty Handbook (Committee) is going to evaluate that. It is my understanding that the Faculty Handbook Committee is the caretaker of the Faculty Handbook. There is a subcommittee that is trying reorganize it, slim it down if it needs to be. We're keeping track of every word that's leaving, every word that's coming in and that's where we're going to start.

7.10 University Relations and Communication – (Nicolle Jordan)

The University Communications Committee contacted relevant members of the English Department in search of graduate students who might undertake an overhaul of the USM Wikipedia page. The English Department chair (and others) pointed out that the job demands a considerable time commitment (and research and technical skills). The chair therefore advised that the University assign the job to Jim Coll in the Office of University Communications. But, Mac Alford noted that the OUC likely will not undertake the job because they see it as not within their immediate purview (and they have other, more pressing work to do). So for now, we are at an impasse in an effort to overhaul the USM Wikipedia page. Suggestions welcome.

7.11 Welfare and Environment – No Report

8.0 Outside Committee Reports

8.1 Academic Reorganization Implementation Committee (Ken Zantow) – The process is going along rather well. As far as post-reorganization, we've made a lot of progress so far. We're on track to have our proposals finished by May.

8.2 Online Learning Steering Committee (Catharine Bomhold) – We met earlier this week to discuss things for the recommendation. We will have one more meeting before the end of the year and I'll work on this next year.

8.3 University Assessment (Mandi Schlegel) - The University Assessment Committee will sponsor the annual Assessment Showcase on April 25 at noon. Dr. Beth LaFleur, Associate Dean & MBA program director, will be recognized as the Assessment Star of the Year for her outstanding dedication to the university's assessment process. Department Chairs will receive the results of the UAC review next week.

8.4 Tobacco Free Campus Task Force (Jeremy Scott) – We've had four meetings since the fall. The policy went into place in January. All of the smoking area signs are down. The deal (problem) with the policy is that not everyone is adhering to it and there's no teeth to it.

9.0 Consent Items

9.1 None

10.0 Unfinished Business (**Moved behind Agenda Item 3.0**)

10.1 Academic Reorganization

10.1.1 Guests: Faculty Subcommittee on Advisory Bodies

11.0 New Business

11.1 Decisions on replacements for resignations and those no longer wishing to serve

{As of March 28: only 2; however, not all new Schools represented}

12.0 Good of the Order

12.1 Next Staff Council meeting: May 3, 9:30–11:00 a.m., Trent Lott Center 207

13.0 Announcements

13.1 Next Senate Executive Meeting: May 8, 2:30 p.m., College Hall 104

13.2 Next Senate Administration Meeting: May 8, 3:00 p.m., President's Office

13.3 Faculty and Staff Awards Day: May 4, 1:00 p.m., Trent Lott Center TBA

13.4 Next Senate Meeting: May 4, **2:30 p.m. [NOTE: Time adjusted time for Faculty and Staff Awards Day that precedes the meeting]**, Trent Lott Center TBA

13.5 Faculty Senate Finance Committee Meeting: April 20, 9:30 a.m., VPFA office

14.0 Adjourn

President Bennett:

Things I would typically go over, my colleagues will go over. So, I will make myself available for any comments or questions you all might have for me related to the university.

Questions/Comments:

Judd: What we're hearing about future enrollment sounds pretty good. It seems like the issue we're dealing with is retention (still an issue). My observation is that students are struggling with funding and support to pay their way through. Can you help us understand if that is confirmed in exit interviews with students who choose to leave early? How can we as a faculty address that?

President: I can tell you that as institution we're always concerned about cost of attendance. The reduction of state appropriations to institutions and what we need to do to address that shortfall is important and it is definitely an issue.

I am concerned with retention. I think we're always at risk with the population we work with. It's something that we're always focused on. Every interaction with a student is really important. It is not just financially, it is being advised properly, being intrusive, and making sure that the underperforming students are aware and address how they can pass the classes during office hours. It is a multilayered approach. For us cost of attendance, persistence towards graduation, graduation rates are all things we are monitoring.

Judd: There is pressure to get through in four years taking 15 hours every semester, particularly in order to keep some federal funding. Is there any discussion on how that affects particularly poor students who also have to work?

President: Yes, those discussions are happening here and discussions are happening at the state and federal level. You might recall a month or so ago, I was the speaker on behalf of IHL and the legislature about these types of issues and about the number of faculty/staff who leave the university every year to get better pay. It is important that we continue beating that drum of the things that impact the student's decision to persist and even enroll at USM. It is important that we can continue to impact students and encourage them. One of our SGA leaders sat in on the search process for the new Dean of Students and that leader said that a lot of the students' perceptions of their academic experience come from what students hear their faculty say in the classroom. If they hear doom and gloom from their professors, students assume that same demeanor. I think it's certainly all of the things you and I have mentioned, but it's also about the things you say to these students and how we act and what we believe about the university experience.

Judd: I would agree with that, but I would say that my morale is also affected by watching the students who can't return to the university.

Beckett: I would like to make a statement and hear your take. You and I have had some very good conversations about the Faculty Handbook. I don't think it's a good idea for ad hoc committees to draft the handbook. I read over the Faculty Handbook Committees' minutes for the week and one of the comments said that one of the reorganization subcommittees will generate the first document of the Handbook and then it says later that that Faculty Handbook is waiting on language to be drafted. Well, that's pretty clear that this subcommittee is rewriting the Faculty Handbook. I have no objections to anyone providing modifications to the Handbook, but I don't think it's a good idea for ad hoc committees to re-write the Handbook. That's the job of the Faculty Handbook Committee. Do you have any reaction to that?

President: One of the things that I've talked to each of the candidates about for our new College has been sort of the space that you're in now. I have identified five or six governance documents that are always on the table, that we always refer to the times that I'm deposed. So most certainly there is significant work that has to be done with the Faculty Handbook, promotion and tenure documents, Employee Handbook and other documents that guide how we interact with each other. I have worked hard to stay in my lane until it's time for me to come out of it and to do something different. So, the work that the Provost is guiding and leading in this effort is really work that for the stage we're in now, needs to stay with the Office of the Provost until it's time for it to not be with the Office of the Provost. I hope that you and others who share that opinion will develop communication lines with the Provost and other academic leaders to make sure that what you said is not occurring, if it's not something that should be occurring or to offer other suggestions or a better way of doing it. I can tell you that today, inserting myself into what you just said, today that would not be an appropriate step for me to take. In 30 or 60 days, it may be just right for the university president to insert himself into what you just mentioned.

Provost Moser

Questions presented to Provost before meeting:

There were two questions around the appointment of Dr. Maugh-Funderburk serving as Interim Director of the School of Communication. I think questions arise because the process isn't clear or there is a lack of understanding. There was nothing underhanded that happened. The process was there was a call for volunteers for that position. From the two departments there were people who were interested, but unsure. The current chairs of both departments were willing to step forward, but weren't quite sure. This all went through the Dean and we had discussions to make sure that next year is a success. I needed someone who could do this work. I asked Dr. Maugh-Funderburk if she would be interested in stepping away from her duties on the Coast for a year to do this work. I thought there were benefits for her to do that and thought there would be benefits to the School. Her appointment is as "Acting" Director of the School of Communication. She'll continue to have her hands in some pet projects going on at the Coast. I wanted someone who had institutional history to serve in this position. We have two talented academic leaders (Dr. Kenneth Zantow and Dr. Funderburk) meeting critical needs in two areas of the campus and university and that's all there is to it. The other part of the question was, is there a conflict of interest for the Chair of the Gulf Park Reorganization Committee to serve as Acting Vice Provost next year? I don't really know what that question means, but the work will continue. As far as the work of an Acting Vice Provost, that work includes ensuring schedules are set, hiring adjunct faculty, signing off on those financial pieces, trouble shooting for student issues on the Coast... I'm just not real sure about that question. I'm happy to go deeper if someone has another question to follow up on that.

Tim: Switching from Casey to Ken doesn't change the work flow that's already in place?

Provost: Right. Ken has served this body very well for many years and the Coast faculty in a variety of leadership roles. I was looking for a leader, someone who could troubleshoot the myriad of issues that run through that office and I believe Ken can do that without missing a step.

Provost: The next question was, Can you explain the process that led to the elimination of departments? Not real clear about this question either, but I will respond in the way that I interpreted it and we can dig deeper if we need to. Departments were a part of the reorganization process generally in the beginning. By June 2017 the plan was adopted by the university and then submitted to the board for approval and that approval came in August. In that structure, we moved from a departmental/administrative shell to a School shell that pulled in multiple disciplines. I think there is a little concern around disciplinary integrity and the term "department." The department is an administrative term. It's a structure, a way to organize something. I sense a concern about holding onto disciplinary integrity across the institution and identity. We have been working on that. For example, as we continue to work on the structures that will support the new Schools, the budget book, for example, will not break apart faculty into Schools. They will maintain their disciplinary identity through the budget book. In our academic settings in SOAR and SOARFin, outside of the budget book, we're really pulling degree programs up to the Schools. What that will look like has probably created some angst on campus. But, in the original documents that were approved we placed degree plans under Schools and

they will continue to flow up to the Schools. Regardless of how we end up branding the units within the Schools we've begun to look for ways to address concerns in perhaps things as simple as titling. Instead of being a professor in the Department of Theater, for all business and practices it will now be Professor of Theater.

Judd: I have a further concern now that we will be misread (maybe) in terms of how focused we are for students who want to focus on specific disciplines. I don't think that will be as clear.

Provost: That's a branding idea and I think we can have that conversation. Anything in the reorganization plan that we misread, we will have the opportunity to reevaluate and adjust. But, we are committed to this Vision 20/20 plan and in order to have the flexibility we are still going to have to be committed to the breaking down of silos, collaborative efforts, and efficiencies across units. It's about finding that balance. I'll be direct in my concern that I've expressed to Deans and reorg committees. In their efforts to work out the details of the new structure, they are trying to place the exact same structure that we have now in the new one. But I'm looking outside of USM and Mississippi as often as I can to try to get a more national or global perspective to see if we're going to fare or not far enough. I'm looking to see where people being most successful and where enrollments going up. We're not doing things much different than other institutions.

The final question was about evaluations in the departments. We may want to move that question to May because the work for that is still happening. I saw feedback this morning and from what was given to me, my impression is that the work we do with annual evaluations and tenure and promotion probably isn't going to feel different than what we currently do. We're going to follow the current general guidelines surrounding faculty choice, about how the process happens. In some instances Directors will serve as the unit personnel committee by themselves. I think there are three options now. There is not an intention to change that. I think that some think that a Director is not informed well enough to evaluate faculty in adjacent disciplinary areas. Where we will create safeguards in that area is that we are going to improve annual evaluations. We'll have documents for clarity so that there's less subjectivity and make it consistent across the institution. Some of the institutional risks we have are often tied to academic clarity. I would like to bring that back to you in May once more work has been done from that committee.

Alan Thompson: Can you respond to Dr. Beckett's statements regarding the work of an ad hoc committee vs. work of the established Handbook Committee?

Provost: Not sure that I fully understand the conflict. The ad hoc committee is not re-writing the Handbook, they are realigning the Handbook. The Handbook Committee still has authority over the Handbook. They're just taking the pieces that are changing from the reorganization and realigning that. They are doing some work with the Employee Handbook. The Employee Handbook is also going under some revision. The ad hoc committee is not walking around campus creating new policy and if that does happen, we have safeguards in place to adjust.

Allyson Easterwood / Lyn Smith

Here to discuss spreadsheet that was created as a result of a collaborative question by Staff Council and Faculty Senate about position eliminations (if they were scattered or if certain areas were more heavily impacted); spreadsheet was e-mailed to Senate.

On the printout we have separated out across the enterprise the impact of position elimination for both faculty and then for staff. We have it segregated into the Academic Affairs part of our institution and Non-Academic. You can see impact for both faculty and staff overall across two budget years.

This was as of the beginning of a budget year (2017 and 2018). These numbers do not reflect mid-year lines or positions that were turned in as a budget reduction. The only thing the spreadsheet reflects for 2018 (the year we're in), mid-year, are reductions enforced and the impact of that across the enterprise. When we finalize the numbers for 2019, I'll be happy to come back to expand it to all three years. It's too preliminary to include it in this presentation. The impact overall for both lines that were cut, anything that's listed in a cut lines column are lines that were cut and did not have a person serving in that position. We didn't count fragments or those little pieces of dollars that may have been related to salaries as far as in the budget. We did have a reduction in force that impacted three people at the beginning of the 2018 budget year, all three were in Academic Affairs. The mid-year reduction was an overall reduction in force of 20 jobs. Ten of those were in Academic Affairs and 10 of those were non-Academic Administration (Finance Administration).

Comments/Questions:

Josh: We lost an Assistant Professor, she left the institution and that line was replaced with a Visiting Professor and that doesn't seem to be reflected. Is that considered a lost of a line? Or is that a change? Does that go with the line or does that go with the individual?

Lyn: We didn't count position type changes on this summary. It summarizes full positions.

Stacy: I know the tremendous amount of work that went into this, and we appreciate your work with this.

Allyson: One question that was sent to me was regarding the reductions that we've made in the current year, how or are they making a difference? They are making a difference. We are cautiously optimistic that we're going to have improvements to our financial position at the end of this fiscal year and this is based on our conservative approach in our finances. Based on projections (we have some assumptions in there), we feel like all of the things we have done are going to improve the financial position of the institution.

The second questions asks, in my projection how long will it take to right the ship? I can't tell you how long that might take, but with a combination to improvements in enrollment, retention, etc. those things will make it happen a lot sooner. I think we need to stay on the path we're on. I think one of the big ticket items that is making an impact in this fiscal year is the work that has been done in the Scholarship Office under Dr. Moser and bringing those scholarships in line with what we budgeted for scholarships. We've had a historical practice of spending more on scholarships than we had in the budget. This year we were under budget on scholarships.

Susan Hrostowski: Because we are no longer able to use adjunct faculty in the School of Social Work, for example, that means that we are having to turn away about 50 students. That's income that we're not getting. It seems like we're cutting off our noses to spite our face.

Tim: We lost some money to pay for adjuncts. Without adjunct for us on the graduate side, that hurt us.

Provost: You're talking about external funding that helped support your enterprise? So we have to go back and revisit that. We have to look at what is the strategy, what is the plan? I think some of the time some of the challenges come when no plan has been presented and costs are all of a sudden handed over where there's no funding to support those costs. But there's never from my office, a time when we won't support growth.

Susan: The demand is great, but we're having to turn students away.

President: Is the turning away because of the capacity or because of our accreditation, or the licensure? What's driving the turning away?

Tim: Last year there was a movement away from having adjuncts and I could pay for them because I had external funding to pay them. That money went away, so this year, not having access to adjuncts, I'm going to be reducing enrollment in the graduate program by 50, but that's just where we are.

Provost: I don't think we have the entire story here. I would like to convene with the people who are making these decisions to get to a better narrative about this. We're not going to discourage enrollment growth. I do encourage a plan and maybe that's where the issue here.

Alan Thompson: As a taxpayer and university employee, I personally feel that I should be a good steward of our resources. I'm curious as to what our monthly electric bill runs on campus?

Chad: I think it's about \$7 million annually, E&G only (\$600,000/month is the rough estimate).

Alan: I'm personally motivated to help see that the university develops a plan to try and save money in energy expenses. Is that something we can try to develop or work on?

Allyson: We have actually reduced energy costs through efforts with physical plant over the past 5 years. We try to do a really good job across campus when facilities will not be used. We try to reduce electricity during those times.

Alan: I'm trying to think of ways to get faculty/staff engaged in ways. Maybe we can attach an incentive to help with saving.

Tom Rishel: You used the phrase earlier, "if we can stay on the road that we're on, then things will get better (financially)." The road has been staff reductions, eliminated budget for conference travel or equipment, substantial belt tightening over the last four or five years, so I really don't want to stay on this road for one step longer. I recognize we've had state budget cuts, and if you're in a crisis you have to deal with that. That statement concerns me.

President: The reality is the road we are on and we have to stay on, is a road of being fiscally conservative and a road of making tough decisions, and a road of looking at every turn, how we can save money for the university. This year, the examples that you used are great, but next year, the savings may be what Alan mentioned. But the overarching road that we're on is being fiscally conservative and that's the road we're going to be on for the foreseeable future. It is the

reality of this university and it's going to be the reality of this university for we don't know how long. There are forces that impact us that we have no control over. Until we can do the things that generate revenue, we will be on this road. I think we do the university and this Senate no justice if we come over here and tell you any other narrative because any other narrative is a lie.

Tom: that reinforces my concern. What I've seen is that if we stay on this road for another 10 years, I don't believe the university will be able to grow from that... if we continue to not be able to hire faculty or not be able to fund positions, or supply conference travel.

President: I understand what you're saying, but if we don't have the resources there, as much as we may want to, if we don't have it there, we can't do it. When we're bound by regulations by the system of days of cash on hand in our surplus and reserve account, our hands are tied. There is very little sympathy in the legislature for what you just said. The decision makers of this state think that we don't cut enough and that we don't need any more appropriations. I share your opinion. IHL and the legislature control those decisions. As long as I'm here, we are not going to leverage our future, because we did that before and it's going to take us a decade or so to dig our way out of that. We're doing the right things and we're on the right track. We need to look at ways to reduce our costs. We need to look at ways to retain and recruit students and market our academic programs.

Tom: I'm on board with that. That's what I do all they long, marketing and recruiting and I'm 100 percent behind that. But, when I hear stories like Dr. Rehner's who has to turn away 50 students from his program....

President: Well, we don't know that because that narrative has not been validated. You have two people from Social Work here who are not certain of the same narrative. Who can't explain the narrative right now in a way that's definitive. We can't use that as an example, because we don't know the facts of that yet. We can't run the university on innuendo, or what we think, or emotions... what are the facts? We found our way in this position because no one (I would submit) stood here and said that kinds of things that these people are saying and work as hard as they have to right a ship and to say we cannot live above our means. That's the narrative, that's the road we're on and that's the road we're going to be on.

Tim: I can give specifics about my situation. I've been told that I can't have adjuncts and that means if I have to live within the E&G people in my budget I have to cut enrollment, and that's what I've done for the fall of '18. I have to make my budget and I have to be responsible for what I got. I can give you all of the specifics you need and we are on the same page.

Charkarra: And I was sitting here with Tim and I asked him the same question because I've been told the same thing from the same College.

Guest comment (K. Kuehn): I understand the fiscal problems. We've lost a number of faculty in our department (biology) over the years. We no longer have a physiologist faculty member to teach that area which is required in our program, as well as marine biology, which is growing and we haven't been able to replace that line. A lot of what we relied on was adjuncts. When we can't replace lines or can't have adjuncts that affects students and the College. I understand the

fiscal problems, but we need to have some balance. I agree that we need to be fiscally conservative, but we also need to make choices.

President: I'm committed to getting us to a different place and working to improvement. I think we're on that road, but I'm not going to leverage the future of this university. We're going to have to restore these things as we're able to restore. I get worked up whenever I think there is this idea of reckless behavior, of doing things before we're ready to do them. I didn't come here for a fight, I came to be a partner to get things better. We are going to get there in such a way that our foundation is solid.

Chad Driskell

There are three primary areas of oversight that I have: Government/State/Federal Relations operations, University Alumni Association and University Foundation

Legislature and Government Relations – We just finished 2018 legislative session. Congress has just adopted the appropriation. We were able to get a flat budget, which means there will be no further rescissions to date with this budget. The numbers to watch for in the news are the sales tax receipts and the personal income tax coming into Mississippi. From our perspective, we're delighted to get a flat budget and just a little tick that's going to be taken up by health insurance. But that means we won't have to use current operating budget to pay for that. We've got to watch the economic growth in Mississippi. There is a constitutional requirement that we have a balanced budget and the governor has to make cuts if the budget isn't balanced. The rescissions that were made last year by the governor were fairly prescribed.

On the Capital Improvement side, last year we did not receive money for capital projects here. In past years we've received generous allocations from the state, and we've been able to couple those with investments with private donors and alumni. We can no longer go to these funding sources for the capital. We have to go with money in hand (private investments, etc.) and then the state is willing to invest taxpayer dollars. We did get \$7.5 million for the Hattiesburg campus this year in capital improvements. We have a situation with IHL that not everybody's projects are "shovel" ready, so not everybody's projects will get the big dollar amount. Next year we are in for \$14 or \$15 million for a myriad of projects. There is \$1.5 million allocated for the Gulf Park campus. We have made sure to have a dedicated line for Gulf Park in the Capital Improvement projects line. As the president alluded, we're in constant conversation with these decision makers. It doesn't always yield the results we want, but we are honest with them. Even if we get a flat budget, we're still going to have to look at, in time, increasing tuition and other things. The power bill is going up, the health insurance that the employer pays is going up, the retirement contribution is going up and there are all of these built in costs that we have to account for in the budgeting process before we ever get to a dollar for any playground. The two primary people responsible for our budget are Jim Beckett (strong supporter of Southern Miss) and Briggs Hopson (from Vicksburg and the brother of our football coach). They're both lawyers and plugged in and on our team, but it's funding and not enough to go around.

Questions/Comments:

Susan: Seems oxymoronic to me that if economic growth declines and then the people that get cut are in education, which means that you have less social or human capital and makes us less attractive to new businesses. They wonder why people are running away. We're cutting everything that makes the human capital.

Josh: Who is responsible for budget projects that are so bad that they cannot get within 10 percent? Are there any efforts to improve the projection models which would help us be conservative, but not over cautious?

Chad: There is a Revenue Estimating Committee ran by the state economist. The boss of the state economist is the Commissioner of Higher Education. So the committee missed it (budget projection) so bad that we all went through the deal we went through.

Foundation – Want to thank all of you who are donors to the University Foundation. We've made strides over the last two and half years in the development operation. We have invested money there. We have six full-time major gift officers and our first ever corporate foundation relations person. We also have the first planned giving officer in over a decade. The University Foundation provides about \$9 million a year back to the university, a lot in the form of scholarships. We have been going through several facets of the silent phase of a comprehensive campaign and I think for this time, that is more important than ever. We'll be going to the Foundation Board later this month to talk about launching that campaign. The campaign will be donor centered. Too many times we've told donors what we need money for instead of donors telling us where they want their money to go. We're also going to engage our alums in an unprecedented way. How big is the campaign going to be? We can't tell you because we don't know how successful the silent phase is going to be.

Alumni Relations – In the Alumni Association Office they have to reach out and engage alums at all levels. We have to stay connected with successful alums, but also build relationships with younger alums as well. We're moving past chapter meetings. We will have to use innovative ways to reach alum. There will be some private investment in technology and private investment in different communication tools. We're happy to send folks to speak to your department groups.

Comments:

President: I have to leave, but I want to thank you for the conversation. I think the way we change the narrative is through real conversation and being open and receptive of other's passions and realities. I think if we keep doing these types of sessions, I think we get to a special place we need to.